Examination of Mr Bradford

1.

Collated

Mr. Bradford

June 29th

Mr. Bradford wish-
ing to continue his cross-
examination of Mr.
Maxwell.

Mr. Maxwell having
declared under oath that the
state of his health would not
allow ~~him~~ of his undergoing
an examination, the Com-
missioner postponed the Cross-
examination of Mr. Maxwell to
Monday next, at which time he
was requested to hold himself in
readiness for the resumption
of the cross-examination & in
the mean time was excused
from further attendance as a
witness.

The Commissioner here sta-
ted to the parties that from the
shortness of the time left him
before his intended departure
for the North & the great con-
sumption of time which had
hitherto occurred in the exam-
ination of witnesses, he felt
it necessary, in future, with
the exception of the cross-ex-
amination of Mr. Maxwell
to conduct the examination
of witnesses entirely himself

June 29th

The Commissioner also stated to the Superintendent that he desired a communication to be issued to the different departments, permitting the suspension of business on Monday & Tuesday next to which permission the different officers might avail themselves if they deem proper, for the purpose of preparing the accounts called for in writing yesterday evening & to be produced on Tuesday night the 2d of July.

Mr. Bradford

Examination of Mr. Bradford resumed by Mr. Sheidell.

Quest. Do you know if any charges made by the Master & Refiner against Dr. Hart respecting errors in assay, if so state the nature of such charges, & when they were made.

Ans. Previous to the 5th of May 1838 such charges had been frequently made. After that period assay pieces were transmitted to Philadelphia for assay & the result proved the correctness of Dr. Harts assays

RG56 Entry 289 Box 4

June 29th

Subsequently that is before the 29th of June last, the complaints by Mr. Maxwell of the incorrectness of Dr. Hart's assays being renewed I addressed a letter to Mr. Maxwell directing him to make some enquiries at the Mint of Legarde & Co. on the subject of some pigs of silver containing Gold.

The next complaints were made in Jany. 1839. Mr. Maxwell charged Dr. Hart with having erroneously assayed one or two bars of Gold Dust. Did you diligently examine into the subject of these charges, & if so, state what opinion you formed as to their truth or falsity & the grounds of such opinion.

Ans. I did diligently examine into them & my opinion of them was that they were false, the grounds of this opinion was the experiment mentioned in my letter to the director of the 5th of May 1838, the assays made in

Mr. Brown

RG56 Entry 289 Box 4

Mr. Bradford

June 29th.

Philadelphia & the acknowledgment of Mr. Maxwell himself, in Jany. last, that one of two bars of Gold, each of which was marked No. 2. which he, Metter & Refiner had represented to me as being of the same melt, but which on reassay differed in fineness 2½ Mills. from the other bars of gold, the observation of Mr. Maxwell was that Mr. Bassett, the foreman of the Melting department must have put something in the pot.

Quest. Did Mr. Maxwell ever state any thing to you in conversations ~~of~~ on this subject respecting one Humphreys, if so, state what he said respecting him.

Ans. He said that Mr. Humphreys mixed the Bullion in June 1838, in consequence of which he required a re-assay A quantity of Silver containing Gold had been rolled out into thin strips & cut up into pieces of 6, 12 or 18 inches & some not cut up

June 29th.

This Evening Mr. Maxwell represented to me as having been insulted up by Humphreys Quart. Did Mr. Maxwell ever call upon you to recommend the dismissal of Dr. Hart, if so, when, & what reasons were assigned?

Ans. No, not formally. I inferred that it was Mr. Maxwells wish that he, Dr. Hart, should resign, for the reasons that Mr. Maxwell complained that Dr. Harts assays were erroneous — Incident that substantially Mr. Maxwel charged in the last summer, Dr. Hart with having erroneously assayed to a loss of ½ Dr of Gold, & that no Refiner could stand such erroneous assaying

The commissioner here called on Mr. Maxwell for a written statement detailing what he had charged against Dr. Hart in relation to erroneous assays & the grounds & particulars of his objections in relation

Mr. Brumbaugh

June 29th.

to the assayers course & reports in such matters.

The Treasurer & Superintendent are requested to afford to the Melter & Refiner all proper facilities by inspection of books, documents & otherwise for the preparation of this statement, which is expected to be filed under oath in writing on Monday 1st. of July & Dr. Hart will be allowed until Tuesday 2d. July to file a written reply under oath to such charges; both parties are expected to confine themselves to the subject of erroneous assays made or charged to have been made by Dr. Hart.

Quest. Did the Melter & Refiner state to you that he could demonstrate from the books of the establishment or any portion of them the incorrectness of Dr. Harts assays

Ans. He did. He made this remark in the Summer of 1858.— & again this year not long since.

Mr. Ford

RG56 Entry 289 Box 4

June 29th.

Quest. Do you conceive yourself as having sufficient scientific acquaintance with the subject to express an opinion as to the propriety of the mode in which Mr. Maxwell has conducted the operations in the separating room.

Ans. I do not, but from hearing him, Mr. Maxwell, say that he did on a large scale what was done in the assaying room on a small one. I have thought that in the separating room the chloride of silver as it is termed was not sufficiently agitated, having witnessed this to be the most tedious part of the operations in the assay room.

Quest. You were present at the giving on yesterday evening by Mr. Maxwell of his testimony on the subject of the comparison of an assay piece made by you in the weigh room & of your remarks and conduct on that occasion. Make if you desire any additional

Wm Bradford

June 29th

Statement or explanation on that subject?

Ans. I never did say that the assay price corresponded, on the contrary I stated to Mr. Tyler that it did not suit at all & I have a distinct recollection at this moment of the want of correspondance from the difference of complexion between the assay price & the bars, the latter being a dark lead colour, but the assay price was perfectly black.

Quest. Is it or is it not the usage at the Treasurer's office to make entries of foreign coins deposited where the depositor is paid within four or five days afterwards in small change, for instance an amount of $200.

Ans. In such a case I think the deposite would be weighed & a receipt issued. I am not attended sufficiently to the practice in relation to small deposites to know what the precise usage is.

Quest. It is stated by Mr.

Mr. Bradford

June 29th.

Guelpi that he brought in the month of April last 200 Mexican Dollars, to the Mint & that four or five days afterwards he was paid $200. in small change of 5c dimes. Do you think that in such a case a receipt should have been issued to him & a Mint Certificate issued and endorsed by him upon receiving payment & such endorsed certificate preserved as a voucher.

Ans. I think that a receipt ought to have been given to him by the Clerk, a receipt of a particular character the procedure not being regular & that no Mint certificate should have been issued at all.

Quest. Do you think that the transaction of Guelpi should have been recorded in the Silver bullion Register, or in some permanent record book of the Treasurers Office?

Ans. I do not think that it should have been recorded in the Silver Bullion Register

RG56 Entry 289 Box 4

June 29th.

unless that should be inferred from the instructions in relation to the purchase of bullion and which I do not know recollect.

This transaction I now consider essentially a purchase of bullion for coinage, but at the time of the adoption of the rule for the reserved deposites, I did not consider it in the same light, & made no reference to the instructions, but considered myself authorised by the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury in relation to the distribution of small change in the Valley of the Mississippi.

Quest. In what respect is the case of Guelph distinguishable from the deposite of Jackson recorded in the Silver bullion Register as received on the 18th April & paid on the 26th of April?

Ans. The Jackson deposite I find (on an inspection of the Register) to be one of Seven Hundred Dollars, which

RG56 Entry 289 Box 4

June 29th

required to be melted, the other I have understood to be of Mexican coins reserved under my direction for a full melt.

Quest. In what respect is the case of Guelpi distinguishable from the case of D. Casas described as Mex. Dollars on the bullion Register & therein recorded as received on the 18th of April & paid on the 20th of April

Ans. Only in this, that Casas' deposite was received as an ordinary deposite for coinage which was contrary to my previous directions. The Guelpi deposite was received in conformity with my directions for small deposites

Quest. In what respect does the said Guelpi case differ from the case of B. Piffet recorded in the Bullion Register as Mex. Dollars received on the 6th of May & paid on the 8th of May.

Ans. On the 22d of April as I believe, I left the subject to

Mr. Bradford

RG56 Entry 289 Box 4

June 29th.

the discretion of the Treasurer who protested against the reserved deposites & I then considered my directions as rescinded.

Quest. Is not the case of D. Casas recorded in the weighing book as paid in small change?

Ans. It is.

Quest. On assaying ingot 52 Lizardi's, were there or were there not found 8 ounces of gold in June 1838?

I know nothing about said ingot except the following memoranda viz:

U. S. B. Mint
New-Orleans June 29th
1838.

The enclosed pieces of silver containing gold were taken by me from an Ingot cast in the Quarter eagle ingot moulds No. 52. one from the bottom the other from the top of the Ingot.

David Bradford Supt.

I notified No. 1. and No. 2 according with the shares — D. B. —

(next page)

Mr. Bradford

RG56 Entry 289 Box 4

Sworn 29th
Enclosed
Assay pieces June
29th — 1838.

In the trial of reassay-
-ing silver containing gold,
two pieces were taken down
of opposite ends of same ingots
(the quarter eagle size) & de-
-numbered the one from the
bottom end No. 1 & the piece
from the Upper end No. 2. In-
-got one melt No. 52.
Resp. by Assayer
July 1838.

He produces the assay
pieces which deponent had
preserved & forgot to return
to the Melter & Refiner at the
time Deponents returned Mr.
Maxwells letter complaining
of the erroneous assays of Dr.
Hart — the assay pieces & mem-
-oranda produced were
wrapped up together by
deponent & are now the
produced.

Deponent gave the assay
pieces himself to the Assayer

Deponent does not know
that there is an account of
the weights of said Ingot 52

Mr. Maxwell

June 29th

after assay, to be found in the weighing book. Does not know if the Metter & Refiner was charged with an excess relating thereto in his gold acct. in July last.

Mr. Bradford here gives over the assay prices to the Metter & Refiner.

Did not Mr. Maxwell write you a letter in June 1858 stating the excess of gold in the Leyarde deposite & did you not on the 17th of July in your letter to the Director say that the gold account was correct.

Mr. Maxwell wrote to me on or about that date in relation to said deposite - dont know whether he stated an excess or deficiency - and stated in Deponents letter to the Director of 17th July 1858 that Mr. Maxwells gold account was correct. Previous to which the difficulty between Mr. Maxwell & Dr. Hart, was settled & deponent returned them their correspondence. Deponent instituted an enquiry

Mr. Bradford

RG56 Entry 289 Box 4

June 29th.

into said difficulty as to gold in July 1858. for the purpose of ascertaining the amount & to whom it belonged. His principal object was to know whether the Assayer was right or wrong. Was perfectly satisfied that the Assayer was right on that particular occasion

Quest. I am directed by the Secy. of the Treasury to enquire into the qualifications & efficiency of Mr. Trastour for Melter & Refiner & of either Mr. M. D. Denney or Mr. Brown as Coiner, recommended to succeed the Melter & Refiner & the Coiner.

Can you suggest to me the names of any scientific person or persons competent to express an opinion on such a subject who are acquainted with the qualifications of said gentlemen.

Mr Bradford suggests that Mr. F. Garcia, Genl. Planché & Dr. Hort be referred to on this subject.

Mr. Bradford

RG56 Entry 289 Box 4

June 29th

The Commissioner request-
-ed Mr Bradford to ask
the attendance of these gen-
-tlemen at 8 O'clock on Tues-
-day Evening

Certify that the fore-
-going testimony is a correct
copy from proces verbal of the
proceedings had before Thos.
Liddell Esq. on the 29th of
June 1839.

In testimony whereof
I have hereunto signed my
name & affixed the impress
of my Seal of office New Orleans
August 7th 1839.

Horatio Davis

Notary

Bradford
Esq